

[13th November 1922]

- 4.—(a) & (b) In February 1921 the district board desired that the Government should become a half owner of the railway providing half the capital cost and requested them to lend to the board the remainder of the capital. The amount required by the board was about Rs. 18 lakhs, and no conditions were specified.
- (c) The Government stated that they were unable to advance a loan in 1921–22 and that it was doubtful whether they would be able to advance any in 1922–23. It was anticipated that no funds would be available.
- (d) The district board resolved that the railway cess accumulations should be distributed between the taluk boards in the proportion in which they were collected; and that each taluk board should contribute to the district board 20 per cent of the share that it would be entitled to.
- (e) The answer is in the affirmative.
- (f) The Government have no information.
- (g) No orders have yet been passed.

Non-co-operation in the Agency division.

441 Q.—Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(1) whether a Sub-Inspector of Police in the Agency division finding a non-co-operator preaching rebellion had him sent away under Police escort with a view to having his entry into the tract forbidden;

(2) whether the civil authority to whom the matter was referred allowed the said non-co-operator to return and reprimanded the Police officer for exceeding his duty;

(3) whether the non-co-operator referred to is Alluri Sitaram Raju described in Government communiqués as one who intends to set himself up as an independent chief;

(4) whether there were risings in the Rampa Agency previous to this: if so, when and for what reasons; and

(5) what steps are being taken to quell the rebellion; and to state the real cause of the rising?

A.—(1), (2) & (3) The Government have seen a statement to this effect in the newspapers, but have hitherto been unable to obtain any corroboration of it. They would be glad of any information in the possession of the hon. Member.

(4) The hon. Member will find an outline of the past history of the Rampa Agency in the Gōdāvari District Gazetteer.

(5) The Government can add nothing at present to the communiqué already issued.

Schools of Engineering at Vizagapatam and Trichinopoly.

442 Q.—Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(i) the present strength of the classes in each of the Schools of Engineering at Vizagapatam and Trichinopoly;

(ii) whether the number of classes and the courses of training given to the students are the same in the two schools;

13th November 1922]

(iii) whether the grade and the pay of the superintendents of the two schools are the same (including allowances, if any) and if different, what the reasons are for the same;

(iv) whether it is a fact that there was a fall in admission in the school at Vizagapatam this year, and if so, whether there is any necessity for continuing a costly superintendent there; and

(v) whether these schools cannot be closed and the students in them be sent to Guindy?

				Third year.	Second year.	First year.
A.—(i)	Trichinopoly	21	38	20
	Vizagapatam	27	28	7

(ii) Yes.

(iii) No; the Superintendent of the Vizagapatam school gets his pay in the Public Works Department plus a duty allowance of Rs. 100 per mensem. The Superintendent of the Trichinopoly school gets the sanctioned pay of the appointment, viz., Rs. 500 per mensem, which is greater than his pay in the Public Works Department.

(iv) Yes; for the present a superintendent is necessary.

(v) The matter is under consideration.

Reductions in the Co-operative department.

443 Q.—Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(1) whether any reductions have been made in the cost of the establishments in the Co-operative department this year;

(2) whether any old officers have been replaced by younger ones, as assistant registrars, etc., as intimated by the Government during the last budget sessions of this Council; and

(3) if not, whether there are any proposals now by the Government to introduce the abovementioned policy in the near future?

A.—(1) Yes; the duty allowance of the Assistant Registrars in the mufassal has been abolished.

(2) One of the deputy collectors has been transferred from the Co-operative department in the month of August and his place has not yet been filled up.

(3) Yes.

Levies made under Kudimaramat Act.

444 Q.—Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(1) in how many villages of the Anantapur district levies were made under 'Kudimaramat Act' and what the amount collected is from each and for what purpose and in each of the three faslis ending with 1331;

(2) whether a sum of about Rs. 700 was levied and collected from the villagers of Kuruvollapalli, hamlet of Rampuram, Penukonda taluk; and

(3) what the circumstances justifying the levy of the sum are, for what purposes was the sum levied, and whether the purpose for which it was levied has been accomplished, and, if so, to what extent; and, if not, why not?

A.—The Government have no information but will call for it.